

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 22, 2008, applicant submits the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-54 are canceled without prejudice and without disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. Claims 55-69 are new. Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 20-24 and 31-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Su *et al.* (In Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, 1994) in view of Frantzi *et al.* ("Extracting Nested Collocations").

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 20-24 and 31-54 is moot as these claims are canceled. New claims 55-69 are patentable in view of Su and Frantzi. Claim 55 recites in part, calculating a likelihood of collocation for each pair of segments of the *n*-gram and determining a score for the *n*-gram based on a lowest calculated likelihood of collocation.

The relied upon portions of Su and Frantzi do not disclose determining a score for the *n*-gram based on a lowest calculated likelihood of collocation for each pair of segments of the *n*-gram. Accordingly, claim 55 and its dependents are in condition for allowance. Claims 60-69 are in condition for allowance for at least the same reason.

Claims 4, 9, 16-18 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Su in view of Frantzi as applied to claims 1, 6, 13, and 24 and further in view of Manning *et al.* (Foundations of Statistical Natural Language Processing, The MIT Press, 1999).

The rejection of claims 4, 9, 16-18 and 27-29 is moot as these claims are canceled. New claims 55-69 are patentable in view of Su, Frantzi and Manning because the relied upon portions of Manning fail to remedy the deficiencies in Su and Frantzi addressed above. Accordingly, claims 55-69 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Alexander Franz
Serial No. : 10/647,203
Filed : August 21, 2003
Page : 8 of 8

Atty's Docket No.: 16113-1230001/GP-038-00-US

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Fees in the amount of \$1,050.00 for a three-month extension of time are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/21/08 _____

/Daniel J. Burns/
Daniel J. Burns
Reg. No. 50,222

Customer No. 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071